UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,067	08/31/2001	Hwan Soo Yoo	TJK/194	3015

26689	7590	01/03/2005

WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON
225 WEST WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application N .	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/945,067	YOO, HWAN SOO
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 August 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08/31/2001</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>09/945,067</u>.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20030122</u>.   6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Cross-references

Please update the information regarding any cross-references.

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS filed on 01/22/2003 has been considered.

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: the reference number 270 on page 7 line 7. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not clear, concise and it does not describe the disclosure sufficiently. In line 13, the phrase "the same" lacks antecedent basis. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3.   The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading and entry of amendments difficult. New application papers with lines double spaced on good quality paper are required.

4.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the misspell phrase was encountered on page 10 line 9 and page 13 line 13.

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claim 1 recites the limitation "the control", "the user" and "the particular location" in line 4, line 9 and line 17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- Claim 2 recites the limitation "the user" in line 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- Claim 3 recites the limitation "the means for displaying" and "the interpreted data" in line 24 and line 28. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- Claim 4 recites the limitation "the book-marking information" in line 40. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- Claims 5-9 are rejected for the same reasons due to their dependency on claim 4.

- Regarding claims 7 and 8, the claimed subject matter is unclear to the examiner.

- Claim 10 recites the limitation "the control" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- Claims 11-19 are mirrored to claims 1-10. Therefore they are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-10.

Please note: The listing above is not the exhaustive listings of the 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph rejections. It is on the applicant to correct the rest of the claims.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted
on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant
for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall
have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the
international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such
treaty in the English language.

8.   Claims 1-2, 4, 10-12, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Adar et al (U. S. Patent No. 6,493,702 B1).

As per claim 1, Adar et al discloses a book-marking system (fig. 9) on user's part for

book-marking a particular location in a virtual space (read as Internet) under the control of a

server providing the virtual space on a network, comprising: means for requesting to the server

information required for book-marking through the network, when the user requests to book-

mark for the particular location (fig. 9 item #924 and fig. 5 and fig. 1 item #118; col. 5 L30-57);

wherein the information includes data for identifying the virtual space (read as Internet), data for

indicating the particular location within virtual space, and data on static objects (read as URL:

col. 1 L26-39; col. 5 L39-55) except dynamic objects which vary with the time within a

predetermined distance from the particular location; and means for storing the information when

the information is received from the server so as to provide the information to the user when the

user requests later (fig. 1 item #124 and item #120).

As per claim 2, Adar et el discloses the book-marking system as in claim 1, further

comprising means for visually displaying the data on static objects to the user (col. 10 L8-28 and

fig. 9 #920 and col. 5 L44-53).

As per claim 4, Adar et al discloses a book-marking system mounted to a server (fig. 9

item #922) providing a virtual space (read as Internet) on a network, for supporting a user to

book-mark a particular location in the virtual space, comprising: a first storage means for storing

data of the user (fig. 1 #120 and fig. 13 #1370); storage means for storing for storing data of the

virtual space (fig. 1 item #120 and fig. 9 item #922;col. 4 L18-43; col. 10 L50-53); means for

creating information of book-marking and transmitting the book-marking information to the user

(col. 4 L18-43 and fig. 10 item #1020), wherein the information includes data for identifying the

virtual space (read as Internet), data for indicating the particular location within virtual space,

and data on static objects except dynamic objects which vary with time within a predetermined

distance from the particular location (read as URL: col. 1 L26-39 and col. 5 L38-57).

As per claims 10-12, 14 and 19, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in

claims 1, 2 and 4. Therefore, claims 10-12, 14 and 19 are rejected for the same reasons set forth

in claims 1, 2 and 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious

over Adar et al (U. S. Patent No. 6,493,702 B1) in view of Orbanes et al (U. S. Patent No.

6,751,620 B2).

As per claim 3, Adar et al discloses all the limitations as in claim 1, however, Adar et al

does not explicitly disclose the means for interpreting the data on static objects; and means for

converting the interpreted data on static objects to an image format, and displaying the image

format data on a monitor of the user.

Orbanes et al, in the same field of endeavor, discloses means for interpreting the data on

static objects (col. 21 L54-65); and means for converting the interpreted data on static objects to

an image format, and display the image format data on a monitor of the user (col. 21 L54-67 to

col. 22 L1-28; fig. 11 item #108).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in

the art to incorporate the teaching of Orbanes et al as stated above with the system and method of

Adar et al for the purpose of converting data to an image format and displaying the image on a

monitor.

The motivation for doing so would have been so that the user is permitted to view, access

and browse large amount of the information in an efficient manner (Orbanes, col. 2 L18-21, col.

1 L24-55; col. 22 L18-28).

As per claim 5, Adar et al does not explicitly disclose the means for return-supporting for

the user to return to the particular location corresponding to the book-marking information;

wherein the return-supporting means includes: means for extracting location information

indicating the particular location by receiving the book-marking information from the user and

interpreting the data for identifying the virtual space as well as the data for indicating the

particular location within the virtual space; and means for moving the user to the particular

location by the use of the extracted location information (read as providing user with the requested information).

Orbanes et al explicitly discloses the extraction module that is in communication with a data source from which extractor module extracts data objects (col. 21 L54-65; fig. 11 item #102) and displays (read as providing user with the requested information) the data objects to the user (col. 22 L18-31).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Orbanes et al as stated above with the system and method of Adar et al in order to extract and provide (transfer) the information to the user.

The motivation for doing so would have been so that the objects are retrieved from the source and are provided to the user in an efficient manner (Orbanes, col. 2 L18-25).

As per claim 6, Adar et al further discloses transmitting data having both information of the dynamic objects and information of the static objects to the user (col. 6 L 9-19 and col. 5 L44-56; fig. 12 item #1250).

As per claim 9, Adar et al explicitly discloses the process for creating the book-marking information (fig. 5 item #510 associated with fig. 9 item #926; col. 2 L18-32), however, Adar et al does not explicitly disclose the means for extracting information for identifying the user from the first storage means; means for extracting the data for identifying the virtual space and the data for indicating the particular location within virtual space from the second storage means, based on the information for identifying the user; means for extracting data of the static objects from the second storage means, based on the data for identifying the virtual space and the data

for indicating the particular location; and means for creating the book-marking information by combining the data for identifying the virtual space, the data for indicating the particular location, and the data of the static objects.

Orbanes et al explicitly discloses the extraction module that is in communication with a data source from which extractor module extracts data objects (col. 21 L54-65; fig. 11 item #102).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Orbanes et al as stated above with the system and method of Adar et al for the purpose of creating and managing a bookmark server.

The motivation for doing so would have been so that the user would have been allowed to navigate and access between documents on the web simply by selecting an item of interest and it allows a user to keep track of the documents (Adar, col. 1 L15-65).

As per claims 13, 15, 16 and 18, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 3, 5, 6 and 9. Therefore claims 13, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 3, 5, 6 and 9.

11.   Claims 7, 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Adar et al (U. S. Patent No. 6,493,702 B1) in view of Orbanes et al (U. S. Patent No. 6,751,620 B2) and further in view of Tomoda et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,832,229).

As per claim 7, Neither Adar nor Orbanes disclose a multicasting means for providing information related to the moving of the user to devices requiring the information related to the moving of the user, when the user moves to the particular location.

Tomoda et al, in the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the multicast

communication system comprising multicasting means (fig. 1 item #117 and #114).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in

the art to incorporate the teaching of Tomoda et al as stated above with the system and method of

Adar and Orbanes for the purpose of multicasting messages.

The motivation for doing so would have been so that the information or object requests

are sent to the device and where the objects would have been retrieved and presented

(transferred) back to the user in an efficient manner.

As per claim 17, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 7.

Therefore, claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 7.

As per claim 8, Adar further discloses, managing objects (read as bookmarks) within a

predetermined distance from the particular location in a virtual space (col. 5 L44-67; col. 7 L1-

20).

Additional References

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

      a.   Borman et al. U. S. Patent No. 6,606,654 B1.

      b.   Goden U. S. Patent No. 6,426,752 B1.

      c.   Matsuda et al. U. S. Patent No. 5,926,179

      d.   Matsui et al. U. S. Patent No. 5,956,028

Conclusion

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on 9.00am-5.30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER